arXiv:1301.0488v2 [math.RT] 5 May 2013

May 5, 2013

WIDE SUBALGEBRAS OF SEMISIMPLE LIE ALGEBRAS

DMITRI I. PANYUSHEV

INTRODUCTION

Let G be a connected semisimple algebraic group over $\mathbb{C}$, with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. A simple finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathbb{V}$ is said to be $\mathfrak{h}$-*indecomposable* if it cannot be written as a direct sum of two proper $\mathfrak{h}$-submodules. We say that $\mathfrak{h}$ is *wide*, if all simple finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-modules are $\mathfrak{h}$-indecomposable. Some very special examples of indecomposable modules and wide subalgebras appeared recently in the literature, see [4, 6] and references therein. In this paper, we point out several large classes of wide subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ and initiate their systematic study.

Our approach relies on the following simple observation. Suppose that $\mathbb{V} = V_1 \oplus V_2$ is a sum of two nontrivial $\mathfrak{h}$-modules. Let $p : \mathbb{V} \to V_1 \subset \mathbb{V}$ be the projection along V_2. Then p is a nontrivial idempotent in the associative algebra, $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}}$, of $\mathfrak{h}$-invariant elements in $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}$. Consequently,

$$\{\mathbb{V} \text{ is } \mathfrak{h}\text{-indecomposable}\} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \left\{\begin{matrix}(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}} \text{ does not contain} \\ \text{non-trivial idempotents}\end{matrix}\right\}.$$

The map $\mathsf{Id}_{\mathbb{V}} : \mathbb{V} \to \mathbb{V}$ is the unit in the associative algebra $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}}$, and we repeatedly use the following sufficient condition for the absence of non-trivial idempotents in $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}}$:

> *Suppose that* $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}} = \bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}}(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}}(i)$ *is graded (as associative algebra!) and* $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}}(0) = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}\mathsf{Id}_{\mathbb{V}}$. *Then* $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}}$ *does not contain non-trivial idempotents.*

We prove that such a grading exists for every simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathbb{V}$ if $\mathfrak{h}$ belongs to the following list:

(A) $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ *is a parabolic subalgebra that contains no simple ideals of* $\mathfrak{g}$, *and* $\mathfrak{h}$ *is the nilradical of* $\mathfrak{p}$; *in particular, if* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is simple, then* $\mathfrak{p}$ *can be any proper parabolic subalgebra* (Section 2);

*(***B***)* $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ *is a nilpotent element that has a non-trivial projection to any simple ideal of* $\mathfrak{g}$ *and* $\mathfrak{h}$ *is the nilradical of the centraliser of* e; *in particular, if* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is simple, then* e *can be any nonzero nilpotent element* (Section 3);

(C) $\mathfrak{h}$ *is a certain subalgebra that consists of nilpotent elements of* $\mathfrak{g}$ *(= ad-nilpotent subalgebra) and is normalised by a Cartan subalgebra of* $\mathfrak{g}$. For a sensible description, we use the standard notation on root systems, see also 1.1 below. Let $\mathfrak{t}$ be a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, Δ the root

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B10, 17B70, 22E47.

Key words and phrases. Simple Lie algebra, indecomposable representation, root system, parabolic subalgebra, nilpotent element, centraliser.

system of $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{t})$, and $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma$ the root space of $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to $\gamma\in\Delta$. If $[\mathfrak{t},\mathfrak{h}]\subset\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ is ad-nilpotent, then $\mathfrak{h}=\bigoplus_{\gamma\in\Delta_\mathfrak{h}}\mathfrak{g}_\gamma$, where $\Delta_\mathfrak{h}$ is a closed subset of Δ and $\Delta_\mathfrak{h}\cap(-\Delta_\mathfrak{h})=\varnothing$. The main result of Section 4 asserts that $\mathfrak{h}$ is wide *if and only if* the closure of $\Delta_\mathfrak{h}\cup(-\Delta_\mathfrak{h})$ is the whole root system Δ.

(C_1) A special case of this construction is a subalgebra determined by a partition of a set of simple roots Π in Δ. Let Π' be a subset of Π. Define $\mathfrak{h}=\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')$ to be the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ generated by $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ $(\alpha\in\Pi')$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ $(\alpha\in\Pi\backslash\Pi')$. We say that $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')$ is a Π-*partition subalgebra* of $\mathfrak{g}$. Clearly, $\dim\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')\geqslant\#\Pi$. It is easily seen that $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')\simeq\mathfrak{h}(\Pi\backslash\Pi')$ and $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')$ is ad-nilpotent. There is a special subset $\tilde\Pi\subset\Pi$ such that $\mathfrak{h}(\tilde\Pi)$ is abelian and $\dim\mathfrak{h}(\tilde\Pi)=\#\Pi$. Namely, $\tilde\Pi$ is a set of pairwise orthogonal simple roots such that $\Pi\setminus\tilde\Pi$ also consists of pairwise orthogonal roots. Since the Dynkin diagram is a tree, the partition $\Pi=\tilde\Pi\sqcup(\Pi\setminus\tilde\Pi)$ is unique, and in this case the vector space

$$\Bigl(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\tilde\Pi}\mathfrak{g}_\alpha\Bigr)\oplus\Bigl(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Pi\backslash\tilde\Pi}\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}\Bigr)\ \text{ or }\ \Bigl(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\tilde\Pi}\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}\Bigr)\oplus\Bigl(\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Pi\backslash\tilde\Pi}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}\Bigr)$$

is already an (abelian) subalgebra of dimension $\#\Pi$. It was proved in [4] that $\mathfrak{h}(\tilde\Pi)$ is wide for $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$. Our proof is much easier and yields a more general assertion.

(C_2) Another possibility is to take $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}=[\mathfrak{u}^+,\mathfrak{u}^+]$, where $\mathfrak{u}^+$ is a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Here $\Delta_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}}=\Delta^+\setminus\Pi$, and the closure of $\Delta_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}}\cup(-\Delta_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}})$ equals Δ if and only if $\mathfrak{g}$ has no simple ideals $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ or $\mathfrak{sl}_3$. Invariant-theoretic properties of $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$ have been studied in [11].

In Section 5, we gather simple general properties of wide subalgebras and discuss a relationship between wide subalgebras and epimorphic subgroups. A subgroup of $H\subset G$ is *epimorphic* if the following condition holds: *If $\mathbb{V}$ is a finite-dimensional rational G-module and $\mathbb{V}=V_1\oplus V_2$ is a direct sum of H-modules, then the subspaces V_1,V_2 are actually G-invariant* (see [1]). For a simple G-module $\mathbb{V}$, this is just the H-indecomposability condition. Therefore, if H is epimorphic, then $\mathsf{Lie}(H)$ is wide. However, our work shows that there are much more wide subalgebras than Lie algebras of epimorphic subgroups. Indeed, epimorphic subgroups are also characterised by the property that $\mathbb{C}[G]^H=\mathbb{C}$, hence they cannot be unipotent, whereas all wide subalgebras described in (A), (B), and (C) are ad-nilpotent. We also give an example of a two-dimensional wide subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and provide a quick derivation (and generalisation) for the results of [6].

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to Alexander Premet (Manchester) for drawing my attention to the role of idempotent elements in the associative algebra $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^\mathfrak{h}$.

1. NOTATION AND OTHER PRELIMINARIES

1.1. **Notation.** We fix a triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{u}^+\oplus\mathfrak{t}\oplus\mathfrak{u}^-$ and various objects associated with the root system $\Delta=\Delta(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{t})$. Specifically,

- Δ^+ is the set of positive roots (= the roots of $\mathfrak{u}^+$);
- $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ is the set of simple roots in Δ^+;
- $\{\varphi_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Pi\}$ are the fundamental weights and $\mathfrak{X}_+$ is the set of dominant weights corresponding to Π;
- $\mathcal{Q} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$ is the root lattice, $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathcal{P}$ is the weight lattice in $\mathcal{E}$.
- $(\ ,\ )$ is a Weyl group invariant inner product in $\mathfrak{t}$. Using this inner product, we identify $\mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{t}^*$, and regard $\mathcal{E}$ as a real form of $\mathfrak{t}$.

For any $\gamma \in \Delta$, let $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma$ denote the corresponding root space. We also fix a nonzero element $e_\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_\gamma$. All $\mathfrak{g}$-modules are assumed to be finite-dimensional. Write $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)$ or $\mathfrak{g}^M$ for the centraliser of a subset $M \subset \mathfrak{g}$.

1.2. **Rational semisimple elements and gradings.** Let $h \in \mathfrak{g}$ be a rational semisimple element, i.e., the eigenvalues of h in $\mathfrak{g}$ are rational. Then h has rational eigenvalues in any finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathbb{V}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{V} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{V}_h(i), \tag{1·1}$$

where $\mathbb{V}_h(i) = \{v \in \mathbb{V} \mid \rho_{\mathbb{V}}(h){\cdot}v = iv\}$ and $\rho_{\mathbb{V}} : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V} = \mathfrak{gl}(\mathbb{V})$ is the representation. We also say that (1·1) is the *h-grading* of $\mathbb{V}$. Each subspace $\mathbb{V}_h(i)$ is $\mathfrak{g}^h$-stable.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $h \in \mathfrak{g}$ be a rational semisimple element. Given a $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathbb{V}$, consider the h-grading of the $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}$, $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Q}} (\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})_h(i)$. Then*

(i) *this is an associative algebra grading;*
(ii) *if $\mathfrak{h}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, then $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}}$ is an associative subalgebra of $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}$. Moreover, if $[h, \mathfrak{h}] \subset \mathfrak{h}$, then $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{h}}$ inherits the h-grading.*

Proof. (i) The $\mathfrak{g}$-module structure in $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}$ is given by

$$(x, A) \mapsto \rho_{\mathbb{V}}(x)A - A\rho_{\mathbb{V}}(x) = [\rho_{\mathbb{V}}(x), A], \quad x \in \mathfrak{g}, A \in \mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}.$$

If $[\rho_{\mathbb{V}}(h), A] = iA$ and $[\rho_{\mathbb{V}}(h), B] = jB$ with $i, j \in \mathbb{Q}$, then

$$[\rho_{\mathbb{V}}(h), AB] = \rho_{\mathbb{V}}(h)AB - AB\rho_{\mathbb{V}}(h) = \big(iA + A\rho_{\mathbb{V}}(h)\big)B - A\big(\rho_{\mathbb{V}}(h)B - jB\big) = (i+j)AB.$$

(ii) Similarly. □

Lemma 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{N}$-graded unital associative algebra, $\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}(i)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}(0) = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}I$, where I is the unit. Then I is the only idempotent of $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Any $p \in \mathcal{A}$ can be written as $p = cI + q$, where $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $q \in \bigoplus_{i \geqslant 1} \mathcal{A}(i)$. If $p^2 = p$, then $c = 1$ and $q^2 + q = 0$. As $q^n = 0$ for $n \gg 0$, $1 + q$ is invertible and $q = 0$. □

Warning. If $\dim\mathcal{A}(0)\geqslant 2$, then $\mathcal{A}$ may have non-trivial idempotents that are not contained in $\mathcal{A}(0)$.

We also need a slightly different version that concerns the case in which $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak h}$ is positively multigraded. If $[\mathfrak t,\mathfrak h]\subset\mathfrak h$, then the associative algebra $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak h}$ is being decomposed in a finite sum of $\mathfrak t$-weight spaces,

$$(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak h}=\bigoplus_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}}(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak h}_{\nu}. \tag{1·2}$$

Lemma 1.3. *Suppose that the set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V},\mathfrak h)=\{\nu\in\mathcal{P}\mid(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak h}_{\nu}\neq 0\}$ is contained in a closed strictly convex cone $\mathcal{C}\subset\mathcal{E}$ and $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak h}_{0}=\mathbb{C}{\cdot}\mathsf{Id}_{\mathbb{V}}$. Then $\mathsf{Id}_{\mathbb{V}}$ is the only idempotent in $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak h}$ and $\mathbb{V}$ is $\mathfrak h$-indecomposable.*

Proof. Let $h\in\mathfrak t$ be a rational element such that $\mu(h)>0$ for all $\mu\in\mathcal{C}\setminus\{0\}$ and $\mu(h)\in\mathbb{Z}$ for all $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V},\mathfrak h)$. Then (1·2) can be specialised to the h-grading, where Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2 apply. Alternatively, one can directly prove that (1·2) is an associative algebra grading and the argument of Lemma 1.2 goes through for positive multigradings. ☐

Remark 1.4. For future use, we recall the standard fact that if $\mathbb{V}$ is a simple $\mathfrak g$-module, then all $\mathfrak t$-weights of the $\mathfrak g$-module $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}$ belong to the root lattice $\mathcal{Q}$.

2. THE NILRADICAL OF A PROPER PARABOLIC SUBALGEBRA IS WIDE

Let Π' be an arbitrary subset of Π. If $\gamma=\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi}a_\alpha\alpha\in\Delta$, then $\mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\gamma)=\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi'}a_\alpha$ is called the Π'-*height* of γ. For $\Pi'=\Pi$, one obtains the usual notion of the height.

Let $\mathfrak p$ be the standard parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak g$ determined by $\Pi'\subset\Pi$. That is,

$$\mathfrak p=\mathfrak t\oplus\Bigl(\bigoplus_{\gamma:\ \mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\gamma)\geqslant 0}\mathfrak g_\gamma\Bigr).$$

Then $\displaystyle\mathfrak p_{nil}=\mathfrak n=\bigoplus_{\gamma:\ \mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\gamma)>0}\mathfrak g_\gamma$ is the nilpotent radical of $\mathfrak p$, and

$$\mathfrak l=\mathfrak t\oplus\Bigl(\bigoplus_{\gamma:\ \mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\gamma)=0}\mathfrak g_\gamma\Bigr)\quad\text{is the standard Levi subalgebra of }\mathfrak p.$$

Lemma 2.1. *If $\mathbb{V}$ is a simple $\mathfrak g$-module, then $\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak n}$ is a simple $\mathfrak l$-module.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak u(\mathfrak l)$ is an arbitrary maximal nilpotent subalgebra of $\mathfrak l$, then $\mathfrak u(\mathfrak l)\oplus\mathfrak n$ is a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of $\mathfrak g$. Therefore, $\dim(\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak n})^{\mathfrak u(\mathfrak l)}=\dim\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak u(\mathfrak l)\oplus\mathfrak n}=1$. ☐

We extend the Π'-height to the whole of $\mathcal{P}$, using the same formulae as above. That is, if $\nu=\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi}b_\alpha\alpha\in\mathcal{P}$, then $\mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\nu)=\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi'}b_\alpha$. The coefficients b_α and hence $\mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\nu)$ can be rational. More precisely, $b_\alpha \in \frac{1}{f}\mathbb{Z}$, where $f = [\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{Q}]$ is the index of connection of Δ. In this way, one obtains the canonical *grading of type* Π' in any $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathbb{V}$. Namely,

$$\mathbb{V} = \bigoplus_{i \in \frac{1}{f}\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{V}(i), \tag{2·1}$$

where $\mathbb{V}(i)$ is the sum of weight spaces of W corresponding to the weights of Π'-height i. Obviously,

$$\mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\nu) = (\sum_{\alpha \in \Pi'} \varphi_\alpha^\vee, \nu), \tag{2·2}$$

where $\varphi_\alpha^\vee = 2\varphi_\alpha/(\alpha, \alpha)$. Therefore, the grading of type Π' is nothing but the h-grading in the sense of Subsection 1.2, with $h = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi'} \varphi_\alpha^\vee \in \mathfrak{t}^* \simeq \mathfrak{t}$.

Clearly, each $\mathbb{V}(i)$ is an $\mathfrak{l}$-module and $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha{\cdot}\mathbb{V}(i) \subset \mathbb{V}(i{+}1)$ if $\alpha \in \Pi'$, i.e., $\mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\alpha) = 1$. If $\mathbb{V}$ is a simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module, then all $i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\mathbb{V}(i) \neq 0$ give rise to one and the same element in $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, if all the weights of $\mathbb{V}$ belong to $\mathcal{Q}$, then the grading of type Π' is a $\mathbb{Z}$-grading on $\mathbb{V}$.

To avoid a cumbersome notation, we assume below that $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple (see also Remark 2.5). Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a proper parabolic subalgebra, i.e., $\Pi' \neq \varnothing$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathbb{V}$ be a simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module equipped with the canonical grading of type Π' (2·1). Set $m = \max\{i \mid \mathbb{V}(i) \neq 0\}$. Then* (i) *$\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{n}} = \mathbb{V}(m)$ and $m \geqslant 0$;* (ii) *$m = 0$ if and only if $\mathbb{V}$ is a trivial one-dimensional module.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+$ be the highest weight of $\mathbb{V}$, and $\lambda = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} c_\alpha \alpha$. Clearly, $m = \mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\lambda) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi'} c_\alpha$. Here all the coefficients c_α are strictly positive if $\lambda \neq 0$. (This follows from the fact that all the entries of the inverse of the Cartan matrix of Δ are strictly positive [10].) Hence if $\lambda \neq 0$, then $\mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\lambda) > 0$ for any non-empty Π'.

Since $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma{\cdot}\mathbb{V}(i) \subset \mathbb{V}(i{+}\mathsf{ht}_{\Pi'}(\gamma))$ for any $\gamma \in \Delta^+$, we have $\mathbb{V}(m) \subset \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{n}}$. On the other hand, $\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{n}}$ is a simple $\mathfrak{l}$-module (Lemma 2.1), hence $\mathbb{V}(m) = \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{n}}$. □

Theorem 2.3. *For any nonempty subset $\Pi' \subset \Pi$ and any simple finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathbb{V}$,*

- (i) *the grading of type Π' on $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{n}}$ is actually an $\mathbb{N}$-grading and $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{n}}(0) = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}\mathsf{Id}_{\mathbb{V}}$.*
- (ii) *$(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{n}}$ contains no non-trivial idempotents and, therefore, $\mathfrak{n}$ is a wide subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. (i) Since the weights of the $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}$ belong to the root lattice $\mathcal{Q}$, the grading of type Π' on $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}$ is actually a $\mathbb{Z}$-grading. We have $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V} \simeq \mathbb{V} \otimes \mathbb{V}^* = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{V}_j$, where $\mathbb{V}_j$ are certain simple $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. If $\mathbb{V}_j = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{V}_j(i)$ be the $\mathbb{Z}$-grading of type Π' and $m_j := \max\{i \mid \mathbb{V}_j(i) \neq 0\}$, then

$$(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{n}} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^k \mathbb{V}_j(m_j) \tag{2·3}$$

is the direct sum of simple $\mathfrak{l}$-modules and also a (refinement of) $\mathbb{N}$-grading. By the Schur lemma, $\mathbb{V}\otimes\mathbb{V}^*$ contains a unique trivial one-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module, and this unique trivial module is the line through $\mathsf{Id}_{\mathbb{V}} : \mathbb{V} \to \mathbb{V}$. In view of Lemma 2.2, we may assume that $m_1 = 0$ and $m_j > 0$ for $j \geqslant 2$.

(ii) The grading of type Π' in $\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V}$ is also the $(\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi'}\varphi_\alpha^\vee)$-grading (see Eq. (2·2)). Then Lemma 1.1(i) guarantees us that this is an associative algebra grading. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{t}$ normalises $\mathfrak{n}$ and $\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi'}\varphi_\alpha^\vee$ is identified with an element of $\mathfrak{t}$. Therefore, (2·3) is also an associative algebra grading and, by Lemma 1.2, $\mathsf{Id}_{\mathbb{V}}$ is the only idempotent in $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathbb{V})^{\mathfrak{n}}$. $\square$

Remark 2.4. It is known that $\dim\mathfrak{n} = \dim G/P \geqslant \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$, and the equality only occurs for the maximal parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ such that $\Pi' = \{\alpha\}$ and α is an extreme root in the Dynkin diagram, see [14]. In particular, if $\dim\mathfrak{n} = \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$, then $\mathfrak{n}$ is abelian.

Remark 2.5. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is semisimple but not simple, then $\mathfrak{g} = \prod_j \mathfrak{g}^{(j)}$ is the product of simple ideals and $\Pi = \bigcup_j \Pi^{(j)}$. It is then easily seen that Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.3 remain true if $\Pi'\cap\Pi^{(j)} \neq \varnothing$ for all j, i.e., if $\mathfrak{p}$ does not contain simple ideals of $\mathfrak{g}$.

3. THE NILRADICAL OF THE CENTRALISER OF A NON-DEGENERATE NILPOTENT ELEMENT IS WIDE

Let $\mathfrak{N}$ be the set of all nilpotent elements of $\mathfrak{g}$. Throughout this section, we assume that $e \in \mathfrak{N}$ is nonzero. To present a (well-known) description of the nilpotent radical of $\mathfrak{g}^e$, we need the machinery of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triples and respective $\mathbb{Z}$-gradings of $\mathfrak{g}$. By the Morozov-Jacobson theorem, any nonzero $e \in \mathfrak{N}$ can be embedded into an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $\{e,h,f\}$ (i.e., $[h,e] = 2e$, $[h,f] = -2f$, $[e,f] = h$) [5, 3.3]. The eigenvalues of h in any $\mathfrak{g}$-module are integral, hence the h-grading in any simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module is actually a $\mathbb{Z}$-grading.

As in Subsection 1.2, the semisimple element h determines the h-grading of $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_h(i),$$

where $\mathfrak{g}_h(i) = \{\, x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h,x] = ix \,\}$. Then $e \in \mathfrak{g}_h(2)$ and $f \in \mathfrak{g}_h(-2)$.

The following facts on the structure of this grading and the centraliser $\mathfrak{g}^e$ are standard, see [13, ch. III, § 4] or [5, Ch. 3].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\{e,h,f\}$ be an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple. Then*

(i) *the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^e$ is non-negatively graded: $\mathfrak{g}^e = \bigoplus_{i\geqslant 0}\mathfrak{g}^e_h(i)$, where $\mathfrak{g}^e_h(i) = \mathfrak{g}^e\cap\mathfrak{g}_h(i)$. Here $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil} := \bigoplus_{i\geqslant 1}\mathfrak{g}^e_h(i)$ is the nilpotent radical and $\mathfrak{g}^e_{red} := \mathfrak{g}^e_h(0)$ is a Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^e$; actually, $\mathfrak{g}^e_h(0) = \mathfrak{g}^{\{e,h,f\}}$.*

(ii) $\mathrm{ad}\, e : \mathfrak{g}_h(i-2) \to \mathfrak{g}_h(i)$ *is injective for $i \leqslant 1$ and surjective for $i \geqslant 1$;*

(iii) $\dim\mathfrak{g}^e = \dim\mathfrak{g}_h(0) + \dim\mathfrak{g}_h(1)$ *and* $\dim\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil} = \dim\mathfrak{g}_h(1) + \dim\mathfrak{g}_h(2)$.

This provides a rather good understanding of the nilpotent radical $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$. Recall that e is said to be *principal*, if $\dim\mathfrak{g}^e = \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$, and then $\mathfrak{g}^e = \mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$. In this case we also say that $\langle e,h,f\rangle$ is a principal $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-subalgebra.

If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^{(1)} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^{(2)}$ is a sum of two ideals and $e = e_1 + e_2$, with $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}^{(i)}$, then $\mathfrak{g}^e = (\mathfrak{g}^{(1)})^{e_1} \oplus (\mathfrak{g}^{(2)})^{e_2}$. Therefore, $(\mathfrak{g}^{(i)})^{e_i}_{nil} = 0$ if and only if $e_i = 0$. We say that $e \in \mathfrak{N}$ is *non-degenerate*, if e has a non-trivial projection to every simple ideal of $\mathfrak{g}$. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple, then any nonzero $e \in \mathfrak{N}$ is non-degenerate.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $e \in \mathfrak{N}$ is non-degenerate. Then the subalgebra generated by $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$ and f is the whole of $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. Set $\mathfrak{s} = \langle e,h,f\rangle$. It is a three-dimensional simple subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Consider $\mathfrak{g}$ as $\mathfrak{s}$-module. By Proposition 3.1(i), $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$ is the linear span of the highest vectors of all nontrivial simple $\mathfrak{s}$-modules in $\mathfrak{g}$. Therefore, the minimal $(\operatorname{ad} f)$-stable subspace containing $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$, say $\mathbb{U}$, is the sum of all nontrivial $\mathfrak{s}$-submodules in $\mathfrak{g}$, and the subalgebra generated by $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$ and f coincides with the subalgebra generated by $\mathbb{U}$. The reductive algebra $\mathfrak{g}^e_h(0) = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the sum of all trivial $\mathfrak{s}$-modules. Hence $\mathbb{U} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{g}$ and $[\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{s}}, \mathbb{U}] \subset \mathbb{U}$. Let $\langle\mathbb{U}\rangle$ be the subalgebra generated by $\mathbb{U}$. Then $[\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{s}}, \langle\mathbb{U}\rangle] \subset \langle\mathbb{U}\rangle$ and $[\mathbb{U}, \langle\mathbb{U}\rangle] \subset \langle\mathbb{U}\rangle$. Hence $\langle\mathbb{U}\rangle$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{g}$. By the asumption, $\langle\mathbb{U}\rangle$ has non-trivial projections to all simple ideals of $\mathfrak{g}$. Hence $\langle\mathbb{U}\rangle = \mathfrak{g}$ (cf. also [9, Lemma 4.1]). □

A simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module with highest weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+$ is denoted by $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$, and ρ_λ is the corresponding representation of $\mathfrak{g}$. If $\mathfrak{a}$ is any subset of $\mathfrak{g}$, then

$$\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{a}} = \{v \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda) \mid \rho_\lambda(x)v = 0 \ \ \forall x \in \mathfrak{a}\}.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^h$ is the zero weight space of the h-grading of $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\{e,h,f\}$ be an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple in $\mathfrak{g}$. If e is non-degenerate and $\lambda \neq 0$, then the h-eigenvalues in $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}$ are strictly positive.*

Proof. It follows from the theory of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-representations that the h-eigenvalues in $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^e$ are nonnegative. Hence the same is true for $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}} \subset \mathcal{R}(\lambda)^e$, and our goal is to prove that 0 does not occur as an h-eigenvalue in $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}$. If $v \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda)^h \cap \mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}$, then v is killed by both h and e. Therefore, $\rho_\lambda(f)(v) = 0$. Thus, v is killed by f and $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$. By Lemma 3.2, the subalgebra generated by f and $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$ is $\mathfrak{g}$. Hence $v \in \mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{g}} = \{0\}$. □

Now, we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.4. *For any non-degenerate $e \in \mathfrak{N}$ and any simple finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$, we have*

(i) *the h-grading on $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}$ is an $\mathbb{N}$-grading and $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}_h(0) = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}\mathsf{Id}_{\mathcal{R}(\lambda)}$.*

(ii) *the associative algebra* $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}$ *contains no non-trivial idempotents and, thereby,* $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$ *is a wide subalgebra of* $\mathfrak{g}$.

Proof. (i) We have $\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda) \simeq \mathcal{R}(\lambda)\otimes\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^* = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{R}(\lambda_i)$, where all $\lambda_i \in \mathcal{Q}\cap\mathfrak{X}_+$, and we may assume that $\lambda_1 = 0$, while $\lambda_i \ne 0$ for $i \geqslant 2$. Then

$$(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}} = \mathcal{R}(0)\oplus\Bigl(\bigoplus_{i=2}^{k}\mathcal{R}(\lambda_i)^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}\Bigr).$$

It follows from Proposition 3.3 that the h-grading of $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}$ is non-negative and the component of grade 0 is just $\mathcal{R}(0) = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}\mathsf{Id}_{\mathcal{R}(\lambda)}$.

(ii) By Lemma 1.1, the h-grading of $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}$ is compatible with the structure of the associative algebra, and by Lemma 1.2, $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}}$ contains no nontrivial idempotents. Thus, $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$ is $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$-indecomposable, and thereby $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$ is wide. □

Remark 3.5. Using the classification of the nilpotent G-orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$, one can verify that $\dim\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil} \geqslant \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ for any non-degenerate $e\in\mathfrak{N}$, and $\dim\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil} = \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ if and only if e is a regular (=principal) nilpotent element. Moreover, $\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$ is abelian if and only if e is regular. It would be interesting to have a conceptual proof for these observations.

Remark 3.6. It can happen that f and a **proper** subalgebra $\mathfrak{a}\subset\mathfrak{g}^e_{nil}$ generate the whole of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then the above reasoning applies, and $\mathfrak{a}$ appears to be wide. An instance of this phenomenon is provided in Example 5.5.

4. SOME REGULAR AD-NILPOTENT SUBALGEBRAS ARE WIDE

A subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}\subset\mathfrak{g}$ is said to be *regular*, if it is normalised by a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Without loss of generality, one may only consider regular subalgebras such that $[\mathfrak{t},\mathfrak{h}]\subset\mathfrak{h}$ for our fixed $\mathfrak{t}$. We additionally assume below that $\mathfrak{h}$ is ad-nilpotent. Then $\mathfrak{h} = \bigoplus_{\gamma\in\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}}\mathfrak{g}_\gamma$, where $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}$ is a closed subset of Δ and $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}\cap(-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}) = \varnothing$. (Note that we do not assume here that $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}\subset\Delta^+$.) Recall that a subset $\Gamma\subset\Delta$ is *closed* if whenever $\gamma_1,\gamma_2\in\Gamma$ and $\gamma_1{+}\gamma_2\in\Delta$, then $\gamma_1{+}\gamma_2\in\Gamma$; the *closure* of Γ is the smallest closed subset of Δ containing Γ. Write $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_\mu$ for the μ-weight space of $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$. As is well-known [3, Ch. VIII, § 7],

$$\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0 \ne \{0\} \ \Leftrightarrow\ \lambda\in\mathcal{Q} \ \Leftrightarrow\ \text{all the weights of } \mathcal{R}(\lambda) \text{ belong to } \mathcal{Q}.$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $\mathfrak{h}$ *be as above. Then*

(i) *for any* $\lambda\in\mathfrak{X}_+$, *we have* $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{h}}\subset\bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_\mu$, *where* $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{h}) = \{\mu\in\mathcal{E}\mid(\mu,\gamma)\geqslant 0\ \ \forall\gamma\in\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}\}$ *is a closed cone in* $\mathcal{E}$, *which does not depend on* λ;

(ii) *suppose that the closure of* $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}\cup(-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}})$ *equals* Δ. *Then* $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{h})$ *is a strictly convex cone and* $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{h}}\subset\bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{h})\setminus\{0\}}\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_\mu$ *for any nonzero* $\lambda\in\mathfrak{X}_+$.

Proof. (i) If $\gamma \in \Delta$, then $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{g}_\gamma} \subset \bigoplus_{\mu:\ (\mu,\gamma)\geqslant 0} \mathcal{R}(\lambda)_\mu$, see [3, Ch. VIII, § 7]. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{h}} \subset \bigcap_{\gamma\in\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}} \mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{g}_\gamma} \subset \bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{h})} \mathcal{R}(\lambda)_\mu,$$

(ii) If the closure of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}} \cup (-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}})$ equals Δ, then $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}$ contains a basis for $\mathcal{E}$ and hence $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{h})$ is strictly convex. Therefore, it remains to prove that even if $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0 \neq 0$ (i.e., $\lambda \in \mathcal{Q}$), then still $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0^{\mathfrak{h}} = 0$. Indeed,

$$\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0^{\mathfrak{h}} = \bigcap_{\gamma\in\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}} \operatorname{Ker}\big(\operatorname{ad} e_\gamma : \mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0 \to \mathcal{R}(\lambda)_\gamma\big).$$

But it follows from the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-theory applied to the subalgebra generated by $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{-\gamma}$ that

$$\operatorname{Ker}\big(\operatorname{ad} e_\gamma : \mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0 \to \mathcal{R}(\lambda)_\gamma\big) = \operatorname{Ker}\big(\operatorname{ad} e_{-\gamma} : \mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0 \to \mathcal{R}(\lambda)_{-\gamma}\big).$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0^{\mathfrak{h}}$ is also a fixed point subspace of the subalgebra generated by $\mathfrak{t}$ and all $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma, \mathfrak{g}_{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}$. The hypothesis on the closure implies that this subalgebra equals $\mathfrak{g}$. Hence $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)_0^{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{g}} = \{0\}$ if $\lambda \neq 0$. □

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be an* ad*-nilpotent subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ normalised by $\mathfrak{t}$ and $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}}$ the corresponding set of roots.*

(i) *Suppose that the closure of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}} \cup (-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}})$ equals Δ. Then, for any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+$, the associative algebra $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{h}}$ does not contain non-trivial idempotents; hence $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$ is $\mathfrak{h}$-indecomposable and thereby $\mathfrak{h}$ is wide.*

(ii) *Conversely, if $\mathfrak{h}$ is wide, then the closure of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}} \cup (-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}})$ equals Δ.*

Proof. (i) As before, $\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda) \simeq \mathcal{R}(\lambda) \otimes \mathcal{R}(\lambda)^* = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{R}(\lambda_i)$, where all $\lambda_i \in \mathcal{Q} \cap \mathfrak{X}_+$, and we may assume that $\lambda_1 = 0$, while $\lambda_i \neq 0$ for $i \geqslant 2$. Then

$$(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathcal{R}(0) \oplus \Big(\bigoplus_{i=2}^{k} \mathcal{R}(\lambda_i)^{\mathfrak{h}}\Big).$$

By Lemma 4.1, each $\mathcal{R}(\lambda_i)^{\mathfrak{h}}$ is $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{h})$-graded and the component of grade 0 is just $\mathcal{R}(0) = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}\mathsf{Id}_{\mathcal{R}(\lambda)}$. Because this grading of $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{h}}$ is determined by weights of $\mathfrak{t}$ and these weights are contained in the strictly convex cone $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{h})$, it is an associative algebra grading and the only idempotent sitting in $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal{R}(\lambda))^{\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')}$ is $\mathsf{Id}_{\mathcal{R}(\lambda)}$ (see Lemma 1.3). Thus, $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$ is $\mathfrak{h}$-indecomposable, and we are done.

(ii) Let $\tilde\Delta$ be the closure of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}} \cup (-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}})$. Assume that $\tilde\Delta \neq \Delta$. Then $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} := \mathfrak{t} \oplus (\bigoplus_{\gamma\in\tilde\Delta} \mathfrak{g}_\gamma)$ is a proper reductive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{h} \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. Hence the simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathfrak{g}$ is decomposable as $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$- and $\mathfrak{h}$-module. □

In the rest of the section, we consider important examples illustrating Theorem 4.2.

Example 4.3 (Parabolic subalgebras)**.** Let $\mathfrak{n}$ be the nilradical of a standard parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}$. It is easily seen that if $\mathfrak{p}$ contains no simple ideals of $\mathfrak{g}$, then the closure of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{n}}\cup(-\Delta_{\mathfrak{n}})$ equals Δ. Therefore, Theorem 2.3 follows from Theorem 4.2(i). But we include a separate treatment for the nilpotent radicals, because it does not require multigradings and yields a more complete information.

Example 4.4 (The derived algebra of $\mathfrak{u}^+$)**.** For the ad-nilpotent subalgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}} := [\mathfrak{u}^+,\mathfrak{u}^+]$, we have $\Delta_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}} = \Delta^+\setminus\Pi$. If $\mathfrak{g}$ has no simple ideals $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ or $\mathfrak{sl}_3$, then the closure of $(\Delta^+\setminus\Pi)\cup(-(\Delta^+\setminus\Pi))$ is Δ. Hence $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$ is wide in all these cases.

By [11, Sect. 4], the cone $\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}})$ is generated by the weights $\varphi_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha-\alpha$ $(\alpha\in\Pi)$; and it also follows from [11, Sect. 1] that $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}}$ is positively $\rho^\vee$-graded, where $\rho^\vee=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\gamma\in\Delta^+}\gamma^\vee$.

Example 4.5 (Π-partition subalgebras)**.** Let Π' be a subset of Π. As the following exposition is symmetric with respect to Π' and $\Pi''=\Pi\setminus\Pi'$, it is convenient to think of it as a partition $\Pi=\Pi'\sqcup\Pi''$.

A Π-*partition subalgebra* of $\mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra generated by the root spaces $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ $(\alpha\in\Pi')$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ $(\alpha\in\Pi'')$. Write $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')$ for this subalgebra.

Here are some simple observations related to these subalgebras:

- $\dim\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')\geqslant \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathfrak{t}$ normalises $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')$;
- $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')\simeq\mathfrak{h}(\Pi'')$ (use the Weyl involution of $\mathfrak{g}$);
- $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi)=\mathfrak{u}^+$ and $\mathfrak{h}(\varnothing)=\mathfrak{u}^-$;
- The weights $\Pi'\cup(-\Pi'')$ are contained in an open half-space of $\mathcal{E}$.

The last property implies that $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')$ is contained in a maximal nilpotent subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Hence $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')$ consists of nilpotent elements and $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')}\cap(-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')})=\varnothing$.

Since $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')}\cup(-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')})\supset\Pi\cup(-\Pi)$, the closure of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')}\cup(-\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')})$ is Δ. Hence Theorem 4.2(i) applies here and all Π-partition subalgebras are wide.

The most interesting Π-partition subalgebra occurs if the roots in Π' are pairwise orthogonal (= disjoint on the Dynkin diagram) and the same property also holds for Π''. Since the Dynkin diagram is a tree, such a partition of Π is unique, so there are two (isomorphic) respective subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$. This partition of Π is said to be *disjoint* and its parts are denoted by $\{\tilde\Pi,\tilde{\tilde\Pi}\}$. This discussion yields the following simple but useful assertion.

Proposition 4.6. *For a partition $\Pi=\Pi'\sqcup\Pi''$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

1) *this partition is disjoint, i.e., $\Pi'=\tilde\Pi$ or $\tilde{\tilde\Pi}$;*
2) $\dim\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')=\mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$;
3) $\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')$ *is abelian;*
4) $\Delta_{\mathfrak{h}(\Pi')}=\Pi'\cup(-\Pi'')$.

In [4], it is proved that $\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{\Pi})$ is wide for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$. But that proof is rather technical and exploits Littelmann's theory of standard bases for the $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$-representations. Our approach provides a much simpler proof for a much stronger result (Theorem 4.2).

5. ON A GENERAL APPROACH TO WIDE SUBALGEBRAS AND INDECOMPOSABLE REPRESENTATIONS

5.1. **Simple properties.** Here we discuss some general properties of wide subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ and related problems.

Lemma 5.1.

- (i) *If* $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subset \mathfrak{a}_2$ *and* $\mathfrak{a}_1$ *is wide, then so is* $\mathfrak{a}_2$*;*
- (ii) *If* $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{s} \underset{\neq}{\subsetneq} \mathfrak{g}$ *and* $\mathfrak{s}$ *is reductive, then* $\mathfrak{a}$ *is not wide;*
- (iii) *If* $\mathfrak{a}$ *is wide, then* $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$ *is an* ad*-nilpotent subalgebra.*

Proof. (i) Obvious.

(ii) The simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathfrak{g}$ is decomposable as $\mathfrak{s}$-module.

(iii) If $s \in \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$ is semisimple, then $\mathfrak{a}$ is contained in the reductive subalgebra $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(s)$, hence $\mathfrak{a}$ is not wide. That is, $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$ does not contain semisimple elements. As $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$ is an algebraic Lie algebra [2, 7.4], it contains the semisimple part of every element. Therefore, $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$ must contain only nilpotent elements. □

All wide subalgebras occurring in Section 4 are of dimension at least $\mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ (see also Remark 2.4), and the same is true for the nilpotent radicals of centralisers of non-degenerate nilpotent elements, see Section 3. Moreover, in both cases, the subalgebras of dimension $\mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ are necessarily abelian. A partial explanation is given by

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that* $\mathfrak{a}$ *is wide and regular. Then* $\dim \mathfrak{a} \geqslant \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ *and if* $\dim \mathfrak{a} = \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$, *then* $\mathfrak{a}$ *is* ad*-nilpotent and abelian.*

Proof. If $[\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{a}] \subset \mathfrak{a}$, then $\mathfrak{a} = \tilde{\mathfrak{t}} \oplus (\bigoplus_{\gamma \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}} \mathfrak{g}_{\gamma})$, where $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}$ is a subspace of $\mathfrak{t}$ such that $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}} \supset \Delta_{\mathfrak{a}} \cap (-\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}})$ (in the last embedding we identify $\mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{t}^*$). If $\dim \mathfrak{a} < \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$, then $\#\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}} < \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{a})$ certainly contains a nonzero element of $\mathfrak{t}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{a}$ cannot be wide. If $\dim \mathfrak{a} = \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$, then a similar argument shows that we must have $\#\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}} = \mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$, the elements of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}$ are linearly independent and $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}} = 0$. Moreover, since $\Delta_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is linearly independent and closed, $\mathfrak{a}$ is abelian. □

However, $\mathsf{rk}(\mathfrak{g})$ provides the strict lower bound only for the dimension of **regular** wide subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$. We prove below that every simple Lie algebra has a wide commutative subalgebra of dimension 2. Note also that it may happen that $\mathfrak{a}$ is not wide, but there still exist families of $\mathfrak{a}$-indecomposable simple $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. Here is a sample reason for such phenomenon.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\tilde{\mathfrak g} \subset \mathfrak g$ be a proper semisimple subalgebra and $\mathfrak a$ is wide in $\tilde{\mathfrak g}$. Suppose that a simple $\mathfrak g$-module $\mathcal R(\lambda)$ remains simple as $\tilde{\mathfrak g}$-module. Then $\mathcal R(\lambda)$ is $\mathfrak a$-indecomposable.*

5.2. **Wide subalgebras and epimorphic subgroups.** A subgroup $H \subset G$ is said to be *epimorphic*, if $\mathbb C[G]^H = \mathbb C$. Equivalently, H is epimorphic if $\mathcal R(\lambda)^H = \{0\}$ unless $\lambda = 0$ [1]. One easily proves that H is epimorphic if and only if the identity component of H is. Therefore, we may say that a subalgebra $\mathfrak h$ is *epimorphic* if $\mathfrak h = \mathsf{Lie}(H)$ and H is epimorphic in the above sense.

By [1, Theorem 1], $\mathfrak h$ is epimorphic if and only if the following condition holds: *If $\mathbb V$ is a $\mathfrak g$-module and $\mathbb V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ is a sum of $\mathfrak h$-modules, then V_1 and V_2 are actually $\mathfrak g$-invariant.* Compare this with the definition of a wide subalgebra, which requires indecomposability only for the simple $\mathfrak g$-modules!

This implies that any epimorphic subalgebra is wide. Alternatively, one may notice that if $\mathfrak h$ is epimorphic, then $(\mathsf{End}\,\mathcal R(\lambda))^{\mathfrak h} = \mathbb C{\cdot}\mathsf{Id}_{\mathcal R(\lambda)}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak X_+$ and hence $\mathfrak h$ is wide. There is a close relationship between regular wide and epimorphic subalgebras.

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose that the subalgebra $\mathfrak h \subset \mathfrak g$ is* ad*-nilpotent and $[\mathfrak t, \mathfrak h] \subset \mathfrak h$. Then $\mathfrak h \oplus \mathfrak t$ is epimorphic if and only if $\mathfrak h$ is wide.*

Proof. Here $\mathfrak h$ is the nilpotent radical of the regular solvable subalgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak h} = \mathfrak h \oplus \mathfrak t$.
By [12, Korollar 3.6], if $\tilde{\mathfrak h}$ is epimorphic, then the closure of $\Delta_{\mathfrak h} \cup (-\Delta_{\mathfrak h})$ is Δ. Hence $\mathfrak h$ is wide in view of Theorem 4.2(i).
Conversely, if $\mathfrak h$ is wide, then the closure of $\Delta_{\mathfrak h} \cup (-\Delta_{\mathfrak h})$ is Δ according to Theorem 4.2(ii), and again [12, Korollar 3.6] shows that $\mathfrak h \oplus \mathfrak t$ is epimorphic. □

Any simple Lie algebra contains a three-dimensional solvable epimorphic subalgebra (see [1, n. 5(b)]), but this subalgebra is neither regular nor ad-nilpotent. Below, we recall the construction and show that the two-dimensional nilradical of that subalgebra is wide.

Example 5.5. Let $\mathfrak s := \langle e, h, f\rangle$ be a principal $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-subalgebra of a simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak g$. Then $\mathfrak s$ is not contained in a proper regular semisimple subalgebra of $\mathfrak g$ [7, Theorem 9.1]. Actually, $\mathfrak s$ is either a maximal semisimple subalgebra, or is contained in a unique maximal proper semisimple subalgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak g}$ of $\mathfrak g$, see [8] for the classical Lie algebras and [7] for the exceptional algebras. For instance, if $\mathfrak g$ is of type $\mathbf E_6$, then $\tilde{\mathfrak g}$ is of type $\mathbf F_4$, whereas for all other exceptional algebras, one has $\mathfrak s = \tilde{\mathfrak g}$ [7, Theorem 15.2]. By Lemma 3.2, $\tilde{\mathfrak g}$ cannot contain the whole of $\mathfrak g^e = \mathfrak g^e_{nil}$. Therefore, one can pick an h-eigenvector $\tilde e \in \mathfrak g^e$ such that $\mathfrak s$ and $\tilde e$ generate the whole of $\mathfrak g$. In other words, f and the commutative subalgebra $\mathfrak a = \langle e, \tilde e\rangle$ generate the whole of $\mathfrak g$. Applying then Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.4 to $\mathfrak a$ (in place of $\mathfrak g^e_{nil}$), we conclude that $\mathfrak a$ is wide. Here $\langle h, e, \tilde e\rangle$ is an epimorphic subalgebra of $\mathfrak g$ described in [1], and $\mathfrak a$ is its nilradical.

This prompts the following

Question 1. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be an epimorphic algebraic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Is it true that the nilpotent radical $\mathfrak{a}_{nil}$ is wide?

5.3. **Example: the euclidean Lie algebra $\mathfrak{e}_3$.** Following [6], we denote by $\mathfrak{e}_3$ the semi-direct product $\mathfrak{so}_3 \ltimes \mathbb{C}^3 \simeq \mathfrak{sl}_2 \ltimes \mathfrak{sl}_2$. It is proved in [6] that, for a certain embedding $\mathfrak{e}_3 \subset \mathfrak{sl}_4$, the simple $\mathfrak{sl}_4$-modules $\mathcal{R}(m\varphi_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}(m\varphi_3)$ are $\mathfrak{e}_3$-indecomposable for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, whereas $\mathcal{R}(\varphi_2)$ and $\mathcal{R}(2\varphi_2)$ are not. [We use the obvious numbering of the fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{sl}_4$.] To illustrate the usefulness of our methods, we provide a simpler derivation (and a generalisation) of those results.

The embedding $\mathfrak{e}_3 \subset \mathfrak{sl}_4$ is given by Equations (3.1) and (4.1) in [6]. Making a suitable permutation of the corresponding basis vectors of $\mathbb{C}^4$, one easily finds that $\mathfrak{e}_3$ can be regarded as the subalgebra

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} \mid A, B \in \mathfrak{sl}_2 \right\} \subset \mathfrak{sl}_4. \tag{5·1}$$

Let ψ be the skew-symmetric bilinear form on $\mathbb{C}^4$ with the matrix

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and let $\mathfrak{sp}_4$ denote the stabiliser of the form ψ. That is, $\mathfrak{sp}_4 = \{g \in \mathfrak{sl}_4 \mid \Psi g + g^t \Psi = 0\}$. Then one readily verifies that $\mathfrak{e}_3 \subset \mathfrak{sp}_4$. Hence $\mathfrak{e}_3$ is not wide in $\mathfrak{sl}_4$, in view of Lemma 5.1(ii). However,

Lemma 5.6. *$\mathfrak{e}_3$ is wide in $\mathfrak{sp}_4$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde\alpha_1, \tilde\alpha_2$ be the simple roots of $\mathfrak{sp}_4$ ($\tilde\alpha_1$ is short) and $\mathfrak{p}(2)$ the parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sp}_4$ corresponding to $\Pi' = \{\tilde\alpha_2\}$ (see notation of Section 2). Then $\mathfrak{e}_3$ is of codimension 1 in $\mathfrak{p}(2)$ and $\mathfrak{e}_3 \supset \mathfrak{p}(2)_{nil}$. In the above Eq. (5·1), $\mathfrak{p}(2)_{nil}$ is the set of matrices with $A = 0$. By Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 5.1(i), we conclude that $\mathfrak{e}_3$ is wide in $\mathfrak{sp}_4$. □

Theorem 5.7. *The simple $\mathfrak{sl}_4$-module $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)$ is $\mathfrak{e}_3$-indecomposable if and only if $\lambda \in \{m\varphi_1, m\varphi_3\}$ with any $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. As is well-known, the simple $\mathfrak{sl}_4$-modules $\mathcal{R}(m\varphi_1)$ and $\mathcal{R}(m\varphi_3)$ remain simple as $\mathfrak{sp}_4$-modules. Hence they are $\mathfrak{e}_3$-indecomposable. On the other hand, all other simple $\mathfrak{sl}_4$-modules are decomposable as $\mathfrak{sp}_4$-modules. This can be verified using Weyl's dimension formula [3, Ch. VIII, § 9.2]. Namely, if $\lambda = a_1\varphi_1 + a_2\varphi_2 + a_3\varphi_3$, then $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)|_{\mathfrak{sp}_4}$ contains the simple $\mathfrak{sp}_4$-module with highest weight $\tilde\lambda = (a_1 + a_3)\tilde\varphi_1 + a_2\tilde\varphi_2$. Then Weyl's formula shows that $\dim \mathcal{R}(\lambda) > \mathcal{R}(\tilde\lambda)$ if $\lambda \neq m\varphi_1, m\varphi_3$.

Alternatively, one can refer to the seminal work of E.B. Dynkin on maximal subgroups. Specifically, in [8, Theorem 4.1], Dynkin describes all irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ that remain irreducible upon the restriction to a semisimple subalgebra. $\square$

Remark. The subalgebra $\mathfrak{sp}_4$ is symmetric in $\mathfrak{sl}_4$, and it is known that $\mathcal{R}(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{sp}_4} \neq 0$ if and only if $\lambda = m\varphi_2$. This again shows that $\mathcal{R}(m\varphi_2)$ is decomposable as $\mathfrak{sp}_4$-module for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

REFERENCES

[1] F. BIEN and A. BOREL. Sous-groupes épimorphiques de groupes linéaires algébriques I, *C. R. Acad. Sci. (Paris) Sér. I Math.*, **315** (1992), no. 6, 649–653.

[2] A. BOREL. "*Linear algebraic groups*", New York–Amsterdam: Benjamin, 1969.

[3] N. BOURBAKI. "*Groupes et algèbres de Lie*", Chapitres 7 et 8. Paris: Hermann, 1975.

[4] P. CASATI. Irreducible SL_{n+1}-representations remain indecomposable restricted to some abelian subalgebras, *J. Lie Theory*, **20** (2010), 393–407.

[5] D.H. COLLINGWOOD and W. MCGOVERN. *"Nilpotent orbits in semisimple Lie algebras"*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1993.

[6] A. DOUGLAS and J. REPKA. Indecomposable representations of the Euclidean algebra $\mathfrak{e}(3)$ from irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{sl}(4, \mathbb{C})$, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.*, **83** (2011), 439–449.

[7] Е.Б. ДЫНКИН. Полупростые подалгебры полупростых алгебр Ли, *Матем. Сборник*, т.**30**, № 2 (1952), 349–462 (Russian). English translation: E.B. DYNKIN. Semisimple subalgebras of semisimple Lie algebras, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.*, II Ser., **6** (1957), 111–244.

[8] Е.Б. ДЫНКИН. Максимальные подгруппы классических групп, *Труды Моск. Матем. Об-ва*, **1** (1952), 39–166 (Russian). English translation: E.B. DYNKIN. The maximal subgroups of the classical groups, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.* II Ser., **6** (1957), 245–378.

[9] V.G. KAC. Some remarks on nilpotent orbits, *J. Algebra*, **64** (1980), 190–213.

[10] G. LUSZTIG and J. TITS. The inverse of a Cartan matrix, *An. Univ. Timişoara Ser. Ştiinţ. Mat.*, **30** (1992), 17–23.

[11] D. PANYUSHEV. Actions of the derived group of a maximal unipotent subgroup on G-varieties, *Intern. Math. Res. Notices*, **2010**, no. 4 (2010), 674–700.

[12] K. POMMERENING. Observable radizielle Untergruppen von halbeinfachen algebraischen Gruppen, *Math. Z.*, **165** (1979), 243–250.

[13] T.A. SPRINGER and R. STEINBERG. Conjugacy Classes, In: *"Seminar on algebraic and related finite groups"*, 167–266, Lecture Notes in Math., **131**, Springer, Berlin, 1970.

[14] Э.Б. ВИНБЕРГ. Алгебраические группы преобразований максимального ранга, *Матем. Сб.*, **т.** 88(130) (1972), 493–503 (Russian). English translation: E.B. VINBERG. Algebraic transformation groups of maximal rank, *Math. USSR-Sbornik*, **17**, no. 4 (1972), 487–496.

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS OF THE R.A.S.,
DOBRUSHIN MATHEMATICAL LABORATORY,
B. KARETNYI PER. 19, MOSCOW 127994, RUSSIA
E-mail address: `panyushev@iitp.ru`